



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/769,880	01/24/2001	Bertrand A. Damiba	BVOC001	5478

7590

08/28/2003

BE VOCAL  
685 CLYDE AVENUE  
MOUNTAIN VIEW, CA 94043-2213

EXAMINER

SMITS, TALIVALDIS IVARS

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2655

DATE MAILED: 08/28/2003

11

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

9M

## Interview Summary

Application No.  
09/769,880

Applicant(s)  
Bertrand A. Damiba

Examiner  
Talivaldis Ivars Smits

Art Unit  
2655



All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Talivaldis Ivars Smits, Primary Examiner

(3) \_\_\_\_\_

(2) Megan Carroll, Applicant's Representative

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Interview Aug 22, 2003

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic      b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☐ Personal [copy is given to 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes      e) ☒ No. If yes, brief description:

Claim(s) discussed: 1, 6, and 11

Identification of prior art discussed:

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

In response to the FAX of August 20, proposing an amendment to item (e) of claim 1, with parallel amendments to the other two independent claims, along with adding new dependent claims containing the subject matter of paragraph 2 of the previous FAX (of August 6), the examiner notified applicant's representative that this would overcome the rejections over 35 USC 112 paragraphs 1 and 2, by making the metes and bounds of the claims clear and by being keyed to the written description in the Specification, so that now a prior art search could be made, for the next Office Action. He also pointed out the need to change the proposed claim language because "the application" therein has no antecedent basis.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached

TĀLIVALDIS IVARS ŠMITS  
PRIMARY EXAMINER  
ART UNIT 2655

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Examiner's signature, if required